



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

obtained control of the human heart and life it has produced characters that are the admiration of the world. It has succeeded not only in commanding the respect of men's intellects but also in firing their imaginations and capturing their wills so that they have given themselves unreservedly to the doing of the will of God as they have seen it inscribed upon the biblical pages. And that will of God has been consistently seen to involve primarily not a mere lip service in the temple but a pure and unselfish devotion to the service of human welfare.

My final reason for having confidence in the Bible lies in the fact that I find in

the teachings of the Scriptures inspiration and instruction for my own personal, daily life. The visions of the prophets and the longings of the Psalmists kindle my own soul to quicker life; and the wonderful story of Jesus gives me a clearer understanding of God and a new revelation of the possibilities of man. I look upon the Bible as a ringing challenge to creative living. I am spurred by its stories of noble, sacrificing service to a realization that I should serve my own day and generation with the same whole-souled devotion and the same, forward-facing faith.

## VI. WHY I BELIEVE IN IMMORTALITY

DOUGLAS CLYDE MACINTOSH, PH.D.

Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut

I believe in immortality because I believe in man and because I believe in God. All else is auxiliary, supplementary.

1. What I mean when I say here that I believe in man is that man's value, actual and potential, is such that his existence ought to be continued indefinitely in spite of physical death, if such a thing is possible. Man ought to be immortal.

The value of every human individual is incalculably great; as compared with the value of material things it is infinite. This is the Christian estimate. It is an intuitive appreciation, arising in the experience of love. Only love could make such a discovery. It is not surprising then that the clearest perception of this truth was the achievement of that divine man who loved as never man loved before or since. It was this perception of love, more than anything else,

which gave rise to the Christian religion; it made morality social and made religion the religion of socialized morality.

This Christian estimate of the value of man is rationally defensible. The human spirit is endowed with moral freedom. Within however narrow limits at any particular moment, the individual's decisions creatively determine his conduct, his character, and his destiny. This belief is theoretically permissible and morally certain. If it is not true, the whole human consciousness of moral responsibility is an illusion. But if man is a responsible agent, his will, given constantly further opportunity to express itself, is a possible source of unlimited moral and other spiritual values. Moral personality has thus infinite potential value. Reflection confirms the intuitive judgment of love.

If then man always remains, as long as he is conscious, a free agent, it will be infinitely desirable at every moment of his existence that he be granted further opportunity for moral self-expression; in other words, his immortality is imperatively demanded. If anyone can be satisfied to give up belief in immortality—even if he can rest content with the idea of a merely conditional immortality, not actually to be experienced by every human being—it is clear that he does not love much. As intimated by William James, the fundamental cause of his rejection of the belief in universal human immortality is a lack of sympathetic insight, a failure to appreciate the value of his neighbor's life as at his best moments he feels the preciousness of his own. Even the least promising personal life hides within it potentialities of the highest values. Witness Begbie's *Twice-Born Men*. Nor is the good all merely potential. It has become almost a commonplace remark that there is a spark of divinity in the most degraded. As O. Henry puts it, "The rankest kind of a phoney will give you the best end of it once in a while."

It is vain to imagine that the "values" of individual personality will be conserved, if the individual himself is to disappear and exist no longer. If individual consciousness goes, all value is lost. All the highest values produced by man are inseparably bound up with persons. All values created by conscious individuals are values for conscious individuals, and if the death of the body means the annihilation of the consciousness, no values are conserved ultimately. All will be lost, for a time is coming according to science when our earth will no longer support physical life.

An immortal existence is infinitely desirable, imperative both for ourselves and for others. If it were left to ourselves to choose whether we should suffer annihilation or continue to exist, we could never be justified in choosing annihilation, simply because the good will is not only an absolute value in itself, but always a possible source of the creation of values as well, and the individual can never know that his will is not going to become good at some time in the future. The intelligent moral will will always choose immortality, therefore, whether it enjoys the prospect of living forever or not. So far from the desire for immortality being necessarily a selfish desire, it is the only possible choice for the unselfish intelligent will. On this basis the immortal life is imperative for others also. If we could not believe in the immortality of those whom we "have loved long since and lost awhile," a feeling of rebellion against the Ultimate Power in the universe would be morally justified.

Incidentally the foregoing argument implies continued opportunity for right choice in a future life. Such opportunity is necessarily involved in the idea of conscious existence. Our consciousness is always characterized by the power to direct attention to some extent. But to be able to direct attention is to be free to do better than the worst possible, or worse than the best possible. Whenever we are conscious, therefore, here or hereafter, we are under moral probation, free to do and to become either better or worse. Logically there is no room for difference of opinion on this point. Personal consciousness is necessarily free.

2. Because I believe in man, I believe he ought to be immortal; because I

believe in God, I believe man is immortal.

The primary basis of faith in God for the critical mind is a spiritual impulse which we may call moral optimism. Made explicit it amounts to the conviction that no external events can bring absolute disaster to the will whose attitude is what it ought to be. It was the faith of Socrates that no evil can befall the good man in life or in death. At any rate there is an attitude of the will which constitutes an inner or spiritual preparedness for anything the future can possibly bring, whether it be outward good or evil, whether it be life or death. With this preparedness of spirit, one need not fear them that kill the body and after that have nothing that they can do. Such moral optimism is a normal faith for the moral man. It is the taproot of the religion of healthy-mindedness and of the moral will. As a state of consciousness it is highly desirable in the light of its wholesome practical effects. And despite anything science can show or philosophy say, it seems theoretically permissible. I claim that we have a moral right to hold this morally optimistic faith.

But if moral optimism is valid, it must be because there is an absolutely dependable Factor in the universe, a Power we can rely upon to guarantee that no absolute disaster can befall the will that is steadfastly devoted to what is truly good. In other words, there must be a Power great enough and favorable enough to man to justify this absolute trust on the part of man. Obviously any such Power would be God.

Obviously, too, it is a part of the function of God, so defined, to guarantee immortality. For if man is not immor-

tal, physical death can bring the absolute evil of annihilation to the good will. moral optimism is not true, and God, as the absolutely trustworthy Power above our power, the adequate Object of religious dependence, cannot with consistency be supposed to exist. On the basis of moral optimism we can affirm God, freedom, and immortality.

Faith in the sufficiency of God and faith in the worth of man, then, are the two main supports of belief in immortality. Consequently any additional support to faith in the reality of a God sufficient for our need is at the same time additional support to faith in immortality. Such support may be looked for in religious experience and in science and philosophy.

3. I believe that in the experience of moral salvation through Christian faith there is confirmation of the reality and sufficiency of God, and thus at the same time confirmation of the truth of belief in immortality. In discovering the fact that salvation from sin is progressively realizable through a certain type of religious dependence, we discover that God, in the sense of a responding and saving Power in the universe, really exists. That this Savior-God, or Holy Spirit, is either identical with or intimately related to the fatherly God to whom we look for the conservation of the highest values, is a natural hypothesis to entertain, and to the extent that this thought is shown to be reasonable there is confirmation in religious experience for belief in that fatherly God. And at the same time confirmation of the reality of immortality.

It is in this connection that I find the appeal to the New Testament significant. There it is the religious consciousness,

supported by religious experience, that is most important. Because Jesus was assured of the reality of God, he was assured of immortality. His morally optimistic faith was confirmed by his religious experience, an experience of the all-conquering divine power in his spiritual life in response to his religious dependence. Because of this he could confidently predict his triumph over death. And it is significant that the disciples in spite of any extraordinary experiences which they may have had after the crucifixion, did not proclaim the belief that Jesus had so triumphed over death, until after the vital religious experience which they explained as due to "the gift of the Spirit." Then, because they were assured of God, they were assured of the resurrection of the undiminished personality of their spiritual leader. Thus the religious experience of Jesus and of the early Christians agrees with our own Christian religious experience, making doubly sure our assurance that God is a reality and human immortality consequently a fact.

4. Finally, I find myself confirmed in my belief in immortality when I consider that this faith which is spiritually imperative and religiously assured is theoretically permissible and defensible. This is the case whether we are concerned with immortality directly or with the existence of God as a basis for the assertion of a future life, and whether we appeal to science or to philosophy.

Science is not against the belief in immortality. That consciousness necessarily depends upon the brain is not the teaching of science; it is simply the unproved dogma of some scientists. We do not claim that science has demon-

strated the future life to be a fact, although there are eminent scientists who think it has done so. But even if the study of supposed spirit communications may not have demonstrated as yet that such communication is a fact, and may perhaps never do so, the investigation has nevertheless yielded some significant results. The phenomena in question may be explained in part as due to conscious deception, in part as due to unconscious or subconscious deception; but there remains a residuum which can be explained only by a telepathic communication between living persons, if communication between the departed and the living is ruled out. But if mind is independent enough of brain to send and receive telepathic communications, it seems a theory worth entertaining that mind may be independent enough to be able to exist without the brain, after the death of the body.

Moreover, as we have seen, there is good reason for affirming as morally certain a creative human freedom. But if mind is free enough from the brain to be the creative originator of some events which take place there, the belief that mind can exist without the brain is seen not only to be unrefuted, but to have a certain measure of positive philosophical support.

Besides, I believe ethical monotheism to be a theoretically permissible and rationally defensible philosophy. And while I cannot go into the discussion of this within the limits of this paper, it may be remarked that every valid philosophical consideration which favors ethical monotheism is another reason for retaining our spiritually grounded faith in the immortality of every moral personality.